

## **Title, director and release year?**

*Not Business as Usual* is a 2014 documentary film directed by Lawrence Le Lam and Rik Kingle-Watt centered on the flaws of modern capitalism and the rise of B-Corps.

## **What is the central argument or narrative of the film?**

The central argument of the film is that capitalism has been incredibly successful at the expense of the poor and the environment, but that a shift is taking place where companies set out to make a profit but in an ethical and sustainable manner.

## **How is the argument or narrative made and sustained? (Use concrete examples from the film to illustrate.)**

The film starts by showing how harmful some of the practices and side effects of modern capitalism are, and then showing how different companies have arisen and evolved over time to not just make a profit but do social good. They are sustainable at their core because they are businesses, but making a profit is one of several goals.

**What sustainability issues did you spot?  
Identify and explain each. (Examples -  
Political, Legal, Economic, Technological,  
Media, Organizational, Educational,  
Behavioral, Cultural, Ecological)**

In this film, I identified economic, cultural and ecological sustainability issues. The new businesses practicing “conscious capitalism” represent a cultural and economic shift in values, and specifically some of the companies that deal in fabrics talked about ensuring waste water treatment plants at their facilities which is an ecological issue.

**What parts of the film did you find most  
persuasive and/or compelling?**

What I found the most compelling about the film was the idea that we don’t necessarily have to throw out all of capitalism to affect change. Micro-finance has been successful in certain poor countries, so we know that capitalism isn’t necessarily evil as an idea, just problematic in practice. Instead of the socialism/capitalism dichotomy, this film suggests a way to reclaim capitalism as a mechanism to support social causes as well as maintain a living.

**Does the film have emotional appeal to you? Why? (Use concrete examples from the film to illustrate.)**

The film has an emotional appeal, specifically I think about talking about homelessness in Canada, and some of the harmful side effects of a lack of waste water treatment in poor and vulnerable countries.

**Does the film rely more on science or emotion? (How does the film balance the scientific argument and the emotional argument?)**

I feel the film much more heavily relies on evidence in the film. They show the stories and success of various individuals and businesses and how they have created positive impacts.

**Does the film want you to do something?  
If the film does suggest action, do you think it is a good idea? Will the suggested action help?**

The biggest thing the film calls for is a change in mentality for both consumers and businesses to stop bowing to “the almighty dollar” and realize that what’s good for society is ultimately good for business. It’s sort of a “we’re all in it together” mindset.

## **Are there other actions that are not suggested that should be taken?**

I think that the film could probably safely advocate for patronizing B-Corps and conscious companies over big corporations that do harm. Maybe they could provide resources on how to learn which companies to buy from and which to avoid.

## **What was the target audience for this film? Why?**

I think the target audience was everybody, really. Though in truth this film is more beneficial to anyone thinking of starting a business.